

## REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected over Yamamoto. The Examiner has further explained the basis for the rejection of Yamamoto. That rejection is based on Hess, with the understanding that laser excitation can result in surface acoustic waves which the Examiner indicates could be encompassed within the claim. However, there is no indication that all lasers produce acoustic waves. For example, the present application talks about a first laser that does not cause acoustic waves and a second laser that does. There is no correspondence between the laser described in Yamamoto and the laser described in Hess. Therefore, there is no reason to believe that the laser described in Yamamoto would produce the surface acoustic waves that the laser described in Hess would produce.


Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected over Yamamoto with the further explanation that lasers cause heat because they vibrate atoms. It is asserted that vibration is a form of mechanical perturbation. To the contrary, vibration is a response to stimulation. Mechanical perturbation is the stimulus, not the response. In the case of Martinis, the stimulus is heat that causes vibrations. However, the claim calls for providing a stimulus which is in the form of a mechanical perturbation to begin with.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 11 and its dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 2, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation